



IFW

Galen Barefoot
Primary Examiner,
Technology Center 3644
U.S. Department of Commerce
Commissioner for Patents,
P.O.Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
U.S.A.

Charles.C. Yearwood.
Sea Haven,
New Castle,
Nevis.
West Indies.
Tel# 8694699329
Fax# 8694699817
E-Mail:- bim61@hotmail.com

Dear Galen,

Enclosed is my reply to your office action ; with me trying to correct
the claim and specification according to the contents of your office action.

Yours sincerely,

C. Yearwood.

Title:- FLYING SAUCER

Art Unit:- 3644

Filing Dates of

Reply to Office Action :- Thu, 22nd July 2004

Most Recent Examiner; Galen Barefoot

Application Number 10/822,792

Patent Under Reexamination

YEARWOOD, CHARLES CHRISTOPHER

OIP/E/JCWS

AUG 17 2004

RECEIVED

Drawings

This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. However Formal drawings are required with a response to this office action.

The claims are informal and repeditive in form and have been considered to be a single claim to avoid paying higher fees.

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. Claim 1 is rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it

BEST AVAILABLE COPY